## Remarks

Claims 1-22 are pending and have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Rainer et al. (DE 19961521). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As acknowledged by the Examiner, the difference between the prior art and the claims is that Rainer et al. fail to teach a step of pre-drying the adduct cake with an inert gas. It has surprisingly found that pre-drying the adduct cake with inert gas, e.g. nitrogen is essential for achieving a high purity and a light color of the solid adduct of a bis(4-hydroxyaryl)alkane *(page 7, lines 7-10 of the instant patent application)*. Applicants have found that the step c) of pre-drying the adduct cake with an inert gas leads to a product of higher purity and a lighter color of the bisphenol A recovered from the molten adduct (*see Table 1, Examples 2 and 4*).

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection might be based on a misunderstanding of the invention. The Office Action has stated that:

> Since there are inert gases in the atmosphere and before the adduct is put into the filter it is in the atmosphere drying via inert gas, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to pre-dry the adduct cake before putting it into the filter.

However, in the process of the present invention, a <u>suspension</u>, *not an adduct cake* is put into a rotary filter *(step a))*. A suspension by definition comprises a large amount of liquid; the liquid is not simply removed by inert gases in the atmosphere. For illustration purposes only, the suspension preferably comprises 2-40 wt.% adduct crystals *(page 5, lines 12-17 of the instant patent application)*. The suspension is not pre-dried before putting it into the filter. The adduct cake *is obtained* in *step b*) by filtering, it is not put into a filter.

Applicants also are concerned by the Office Action's statement that:

> Also, applicants invention only requires drying to be done once and Rainer et al's invention does dry the adduct cake at least once, *therefore one having ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to dry the adduct cake before washing as it is done so in Rainer et al's disclosure.*

Emphasis added. Applicants respectfully submit that Rainer et al's disclosure does not teach or suggest anywhere drying of the adduct cake before washing. To the contrary, Rainer et al. only disclose passing nitrogen through the **washed** filter cake *([0028], lines 3-4 and [0038], lines 7-8 of US 2003/0038094*[1]*).*

As to the Office Action's statement that, "Please also note that Rainer et al purifies continuously; therefore there is actually drying taking place before washing as the steps are done more than once," Applicants respectfully submit that Rainer et al's disclosure does not teach or suggest anywhere repeated washing steps. In the continuous process taught by Rainer, vacuum drum filters are used which contain as filter cells a cake-forming zone (12), a washing zone (13), a drying suction zone (14), an aeration zone (15) and optionally a cake removal zone (10) and a cloth rinsing zone (*[0015] of US 2003/0038094*). Rainer et al's disclosure does not teach or suggest anywhere that the adduct cake passes the washing zone (13) repeatedly.

Applicants submit that no *prima facie* case of obviousness has been established, and thus, the rejection was improper.

The Examiner is cordially invited to call the undersigned if it will facilitate prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

July 18, 2008

/Brian J. Hubbard/

Brian J. Hubbard
Registration No. 45,873
Phone: 989-636-6007

P. O. Box 1967
Midland, MI 48641-1967

BJH/srl

[1] DE 19961521 (cited by the present Office Action) and US 2003038094 were both listed as patent family members of WO 01/46105 cited in the International Search Report for the parent application of the present case. For the Examiner's convenience Applicants refer to US 2003/0038094 A.